



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/749,664

12/28/2000

Erwin Adrianus Richardus Van Der Linden

0142-0342P

8704

2292

7590

09/03/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 09/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/749,664

Applicant(s)

VAN DER LINDEN ET AL.

Examiner

(Iraj) Alan Rahimi

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


TWYLER LAMB
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: 9
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 25, 29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosekrans et al. (US patent 5,450,571).

Regarding claim 1, Rosekrans discloses a method, for submitting jobs to a reproduction center system 10, comprising:

creating, on behalf of the reproduction center, a submission form description indicating print options currently available at the reproduction center, said submission form description being suited for electronic transmission to a client and for generating, at the client, a submission form capable of being filled-in electronically by the client(column 3, lines 11-36);

creating an electronic document file upon receipt of a job request including document data from a client, storing the document data therein, and sending the submission form description to the client (column 3, lines 29-36); and

storing job specifications in an electronic job ticket linked to said document file upon receipt of the submission form from the client with the job specifications filled-in (column 3, lines 6-67 and column 4, lines 12-19).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 3, Rosekrans discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said electronic job ticket is created and the job specifications stored therein upon receipt of the submission form from the client (column 3, lines 11-37).

Regarding claim 4, Rosekrans discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the document data are transmitted to the reproduction center and are then, at the reproduction center, transformed into a format suitable for printing on a printer that has been selected for that purpose.

Regarding claim 9, Rosekrans discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising:

automatically updating, at the reproduction center, information on print capabilities of printers available in the reproduction center (column 5, lines 30-40 and column 58-67); and

automatically updating said submission form description in conformity with said information (column 6, lines 53-67).

Regarding claim 10, Rosekrans discloses a reproduction system, comprising:

a reproduction center including a print engine 12-1;

a client computer 15-1 connected to the reproduction center through a data network;

and

a print server 25 storing information on print options currently available in the

Art Unit: 2622

reproduction center and programmed to communicate, as a virtual printer, with driver software installed on said client computer, said communicating including, upon reception from a client computer of a job request including document data for printing, sending a preprogrammed job submission form description based on said currently available print options information (column 3, lines 11-37),

said driver software including, in place of a print dialog, a job submission form which is dynamically configured in response to said preprogrammed job submission form description sent by the print server (column 4, lines 53-68 and column 5, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 11, Rosekrans discloses the reproduction system according to claim 10, wherein said driver software includes a printer driver which can be called up from a desktop application installed on the client computer (column 10, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 25, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Regarding claim 29, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 9, are applicable.

Regarding claims 31, and 32, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-7, 12, 13, 17-24, 26, 30 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosekrans (US patent 5,450,571) in view of Wake et al. (US patent 6,587,861).

Regarding claim 5, Rosekrans does not disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein the document data transmitted to the reproduction center are converted there into a format suitable for showing the final appearance of the printed document and are upon request transmitted in this format to the client for preview purposes.

However Wake et al. discloses the preview function in Fig. 11.

Rosekrans and Wake are combinable because they are from the same filed of endeavor that is processing print jobs in a network printing system.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, to have a preview function for viewing the document.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to avoid unnecessary printing of document and causing waste if the final document was not acceptable to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Rosekrans with Wake to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Wake discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein internet transmission protocols are used for data traffic between the client and the reproduction center (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 7, Rosekrans discloses the method according to claim 6, wherein the submission form description is transmitted to the client as a program code that is interpreted at the client to electronically create the submission form and allow the client to interact with the reproduction center by entering information and commands into the submission form (column 3, lines 11-28).

Regarding claim 12, Wake et al. discloses the reproduction system according to claim 11, wherein the driver software further includes a daemon activated by said printer driver or by the occurrence of a file created by said printer driver, said daemon functioning to establish a data connection between the client computer and the print server (column 10, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 13, Wake discloses the reproduction system according to claim 10, wherein the print server includes

- a file transfer server (web server 204) for exchanging document data with the client computer,

- a memory 104 for storing document files received from the client computer in the form of a database,

- a memory 104 for storing active server pages for communication via a server with

Art Unit: 2622

said driver software, and

a job ticket store 104 for storing the contents of the submission form received through said server as a database.

Regarding claims 23 and 24 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13, are applicable.

Regarding claims 17, 19, 21, 30, 33 and 34 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 5, are applicable.

Regarding claims 18, 20 and 22 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

Regarding claim 26, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 7, are applicable.

Regarding claim 35, Rosekrans does not specifically disclose 35 the article according to claim 32, wherein the third program code segment does not send the submission form if a user enters a cancel command. However it is well known in the art that execution of cancel command will cause instruction for processing the function are halted. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use the cancel button to stop submission form.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 36, Rosekrans does not specifically disclose the article according to claim 25, wherein the software is embodied on a computer-readable medium. However it is well known in the art that software is recorded on computer readable medium.

Regarding claim 37 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 36 are applicable.

5. Claims 8, 14-16 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosekrans (US patent 5,450,571) in view of Leiman (US patent 6,469,796).

Regarding claim 8, Rosekrans discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising:

updating, at the reproduction center, information on print capabilities of available printers in the reproduction center (column 5, lines 30-40).

However he does not disclose automatically selecting one of the available printers for a print job on the basis of said information.

Leiman (US patent 6,469,796) discloses in column 1, lines 51-60 automatic routing of print jobs to printers.

Rosekrans and Leiman are combinable because they are from the same filed of endeavor that is network printing systems.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, to use automatic selection of printer to perform a printing job.

Art Unit: 2622

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been reduce burden on the user/operator in keeping up with specific printer capabilities especially as new ones are added.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Rosekrans with Leiman to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 14, Leiman discloses the reproduction system according to claim 13, further comprising:

a device capabilities store (resource manager 133) storing information on the capabilities of each printer available in the reproduction center (column 5, lines 34-37); and

a scheduler communicating with the job ticket store and the device capabilities store and automatically routing each job to a printer capable of executing the job (column 5, lines 34-37).

Regarding claim 15, Leiman discloses the reproduction system according to claim 10, further comprising:

an operator console connected to said print server for editing said job submission form description (Fig. 5).

Regarding claims 16 and 27-29 arguments analogous to those presented for claim 8, are applicable.

Art Unit: 2622

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Other Prior Art Cited

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sperry et al. (US patent 5,995,723) discloses client sub-system for changing document/job attributes in a network environment.

Jackson, Jr. (US patent 5,793,938) discloses document printing management system.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR

Alan Rahimi
September 2, 2004


TWYLER LAMB
PRIMARY EXAMINER